

Appln No. 10/713,076  
Amdt. Dated October 15, 2004, 2004  
Response to Office action of August 25, 2004

4

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY****REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The objections and submissions made by the Examiner in the Office Action have been carefully considered. Appropriate amendments have been introduced in the claims.

**Claim Objections**

The Examiner has objected to claim 1 on the basis that the printhead modules are not integers of the claim and, therefore, the limitation related to their "coefficient of thermal expansion" lacks clarity. The Applicant contests this conclusion of the Examiner. It is well established that claim limitations can be defined with reference to features in the claim preamble. The Applicant draws the Examiner's attention to the "... for ..." claim language which is widely accepted in the claim drafting practice.

In this particular case, claim 1 defines "the" coefficient of thermal expansion of the beam on the basis that all solids have a coefficient of thermal expansion. Therefore, there is an inherent antecedent for this property of the beam. This property (the coefficient of thermal expansion) is then further defined by reference to the corresponding property of the printheads introduced in the preamble of the claim. It is submitted that this is a valid claim structure. However, in deference to the Examiner's opinion and in an attempt to further clarify the scope of the claimed invention, claim 1 has been amended to limit the invention to the predetermined coefficient of thermal expansion of the printhead modules to be used with the support beam.

For a reason similar to the one discussed above, the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's objection to claims 5, 6 and 10. However, in the interest of a speedy prosecution of this application, these claims have been rewritten to emphasize the fact that the printhead modules are used only as a reference for a limitation which is imposed on the claimed support structure.

In a response to the Examiner's objection to claim 9, the claim has been amended to clarify to which structural elements the various coefficients of thermal expansion refer. Finally, following the Examiner's comment, the indefinite particle "an" has been introduced between the terms "from" and "odd" in claim 1.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the helpful comments in this section.

Appln No. 10/713,076  
Amdt. Dated October 15, 2004, 2004  
Response to Office action of August 25, 2004

5

In light of the introduced amendments and the above discussions, it is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



---

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**